

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON 25. D. C.

May 1, 1953

DEPARTMENTAL CIRCULAR NO. 708

TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

SUBJECT: Designation of Officers and Employees to Security Hearing Board Rosters.

1. Executive Order No. 10450, which prescribes security requirements for Government employment, becomes effective May 28, 1953. In a memorandum to the Heads of All Departments and Agencies which accompanied the Order, the President requested the head of each department and agency "to designate, as requested by the Civil Service Commission, persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment, to be available for service as members of security hearing boards of other departments and agencies." The sample security regulations which were distributed with the Executive Order indicate further that security hearing boards are to be composed of civilian officers or employees, that each person named to the roster shall have been the subject of a full field investigation, and that his designation to the roster has been determined to be clearly consistent with the interest of national security.
2. In accordance with the President's memorandum, you are requested to submit to the Civil Service Commission as promptly as possible the names of employees you have designated for the rosters. A list of such employees for the departmental service in Washington, D. C. is to be submitted to the central office of the Commission, attention, Chief Law Officer. This list must be received in the Commission by May 20, 1953.
3. The sample security regulations indicate that rosters are to be maintained also in the regional offices of the Commission. You are requested to send designations of field service employees direct to the appropriate regional director of the Commission. In order to obtain a reasonable geographical distribution of names on the roster, it is requested that designations be made from each field office or installation having 500 or more full-time employees. If it is not possible to submit these lists to the Commission's regional office by May 20, they should be submitted as soon thereafter as possible.

4. Each list should contain the name of each employee designated, his place of employment (street, city, and state) and the telephone number of the office through which arrangements can be made for his services on the security hearing board. Each sheet containing one or more names should have a statement by the submitting officer that each person named on the list has been the subject of a full field investigation and that his designation has been determined to be clearly consistent with the interest of national security. Each list should be submitted in duplicate.

5. At this time we are not requiring the designation of any specific number of employees. Agencies will be requested to make additional designations if the rosters that are established prove insufficient.

6. Inquiries concerning this circular may be made by telephone, Code 171, Extension 3070. A list is enclosed showing the location of the Commission's regional offices and the states which comprise each region.

By direction of the Commission:

C. L. Edwards

C. L. Edwards
Executive Director

Attachment: CSC Form 2504 (December 1952)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE REGIONS

For convenience in administration of the field service the Commission has divided the United States into regions and territorial units. The following shows the names of the Commission's regional directors and their headquarters, managers of the branch regional offices and their headquarters, the headquarters of the Commission's representatives outside the continental United States, and the geographic areas over which these officials have jurisdiction.

REGION	HEADQUARTERS	SUPERVISORS	TERRITORY SERVED
First-----	Post Office and Courthouse Building, Boston 9, Mass.	Wm. A. Foley, Director; Richard J. Healey, Deputy Director.	Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.
Second-----	Federal Building, Christopher Street, New York 14, N. Y.	James E. Rossell, Director; Lawrence H. Baer, Deputy Director.	New York and New Jersey.
Third-----	Customhouse, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia 6, Pa.	Stephen P. Ryder, Director; William A. Brady, Deputy Director.	Pennsylvania and Delaware.
Fourth-----	Temporary "R" Building, 4th Street and Jefferson Drive SW., Washington 25, D. C.	Thomas D. Dunn, Director; E. S. Burrows, Deputy Director.	Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia.
Fifth-----	5 Forsyth Street NW., Atlanta 3, Ga.	Orie E. Myers, Director; John W. Godbold, Deputy Director.	South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.
Sixth-----	Post Office and Courthouse Building, Cincinnati 2, Ohio.	Louis S. Lyon, Director; Bernard Rosen, Deputy Director.	Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky.
Seventh-----	New Post Office Building, Chicago 7, Ill.	Joseph A. Connor, Director; Walter E. Elder, Deputy Director.	Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois.
Eighth-----	Post Office and Customhouse Building, St. Paul 1, Minn.	Nicholas J. Oganovic, Director; John E. Beckman, Deputy Director.	Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa.
Ninth-----	New Federal Building, St. Louis 1, Mo.	Mrs. Bobbie M. Snoddy, Director; Albert H. Sonntag, Deputy Director.	Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Arkansas.
Tenth-----	442 Canal Street, New Orleans 16, La.	A. J. Leach, Director; W. Wallace McDougall, Deputy Director.	Mississippi, Louisiana, and Panama Canal Zone.
Eleventh---	302 Federal Office Building, First Avenue and Madison Street, Seattle 4, Wash.	James P. Cooley, Director; Harold E. Blinn, Deputy Director.	Montana, Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and Territory of Alaska.
Twelfth----	128 Appraisers Building, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.	Harry T. Kranz, Director; Mrs. Ethel L. Mears, Deputy Director.	California, Nevada, Arizona, and the Territory of Hawaii.
	Branch Regional Offices: 514 Post Office and Courthouse Building, Los Angeles 12, Calif.	Justice M. Kashevaroff, Manager-----	California: Counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange, Los Angeles, Ventura, and Santa Barbara.
	Federal Building, Honolulu 2, T. H.	W. T. Atkinson, Manager-----	Territory of Hawaii.
Thirteenth--	Building 41, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo.	James P. Googe, Director; Ben L. Fischbach, Deputy Director.	Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.
Fourteenth--	1114 Commerce Street, Dallas 2, Tex.	Paul H. Figg, Director; Samuel M. Ray, Deputy Director.	Texas.


REPRESENTATIVES OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Hawaii (subsidiary to Twelfth Region).—W. T. Atkinson, Manager, Branch Regional Office, Twelfth United States Civil Service Region, Federal Building, Honolulu 2, T. H.

Puerto Rico (subsidiary to Fifth Region).—Mr. Ruel B. George, Civil Service Representative, Central Board of Examiners for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, Room 218, Post Office Building, San Juan, P. R.

Canal Zone (subsidiary to Tenth Region).—Secretary, Board of United States Civil Service Examiners, Balboa Heights, C. Z., insofar as examinations under the Board of United States Civil Service Examiners are concerned.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE REGIONS



The New Security Order

As a lawyer with some years of practice in Washington I had come to believe there were faults in the loyalty-security program in effect under the last Administration. But the Republican substitute is worse—so much worse that any partisan satisfaction which that fact might give me as a Democrat is overwhelmed by the dismay it causes me as a citizen. The former program at least made a serious effort to satisfy two demands not readily reconcilable: protecting the Federal service against subversion; and assuring the maintenance of a fair and objective standard for hiring and job retention. The new order, in concentrating on the first objective, has lost sight of the second; in so doing it has performed a net disservice to the interests of our national security.

Contrary to the impression created by the President, the procedures elaborated by the draftsmen of the order are not new or original; in their essentials they have been borrowed from existing legislation. This legislation, intended originally to apply to a limited number of security-sensitive agencies, has now been stretched with dubious legality to blanket all Federal agencies.

The most serious procedural problem in this area has always been to give employees an opportunity, consistent with the demands of security, to be told the charges against them and to confront their accusers. The new order leaves it for the security officer to determine how much

adequate. Yet the new order provides full protection for the "confidential informants." Whatever the interest in the protection of continuing sources of information—the professional informers—there is absolutely none in shielding casual informants. In fact, their willingness to acknowledge their statements may be a useful index of their credibility.

The new order offers no definition of the "confidential informant" whose anonymity it protects. The phrase can and almost certainly will be used to embrace crackpots, frustrated fellow employees and grudge-bearing neurotics.

The principal change made in the procedures—the change in the method of selecting hearing boards—has some merit. Under the new order these boards are to be composed of officers and employees from agencies other than that of the accused employee. But while the new order takes one step forward toward greater impartiality, it takes at least two steps back when it provides that the nominees for the hearing board roster shall be picked by the personnel security officers of the various agencies. These officers, concerned exclusively with protecting security, will almost certainly restrict their choices to persons known to favor an exclusionary policy.

The Attorney General has referred to the present Loyalty Review Board as "discredited." He proposes to solve the problem of a "discredited" review by independent citizens, by providing none at all. The only check on

Even if the procedures established in the new order met minimum standards of fairness and objectivity, the criteria laid down for determining when an employee is a security risk are so broad as to threaten the integrity of the merit system. Subject only to the informal discretion of personnel security officers, an employee can be set on the road toward suspension and termination if, for example, information is "developed" on "any behavior, activity or associations which tend to show that the individual is not trustworthy or reliable."

This provides an opportunity to liquidate civil servants without the tedium and publicity of existing Civil Service dismissal procedures. Such an opportunity will not long escape the notice of agency heads.

The order exalts a new power group within the Federal structure. Even under the old procedures the security officer was rapidly becoming a man to be feared by all employees, however loyal and honest. The new order gives him a practical power of life or death over their careers. Its particular vice is that it offers the possibility for effective control of the Government service by a well-placed, ambitious man who can obtain the allegiance of key security officers.

The standards and procedures embodied in the new order will have destructive effects on the Federal service. They empower the personnel security officer to make the determination for which the Civil Service system

\$1.50

98¢

\$1.69

ington quart
cleaner. See demonstration, street floor, Wash-
polishes in one action. Makes 2 gallons of
Slat-O-Clean, triple-action cleaner. Cleans, rinses,
plate with holder \$1.69.
tion. Pads are washable. Use above tool or com-
sorb dust on both sides of the slat in one opera-
Slat-O-Mat-Duster, genuine lamb's wool pads ab-
left drip-free and sparkling clean.
sides of slat and behind tape in one stroke! Slat is
Slat-O-Mat Washer, DuPont sponges, wash both